Ltr to Hoch under AGB

Dear Jeff, 12/30/78

When I got home last night I was tired. I got up the usual early hour this morning to catch up some and be prepared for the coming of a friend I hope will be able to take some trees down for me, after which I'll convert them as I can to firewood, asI've been doing since the last time he did this. I've not yet unpacked my bag.

I apprecaiate your showing me your look to the future at the end of the hearings. I skimmed it and answered your question, do I have any problems with it. I said I don't and in fact I don't, if that is what you, individually or collectively want to do. There was no time for more conversation about it.

But I don't want you to misunderstand from the brevity of it all. It is not for me or for any of my time.

The basic reason is because I see no ~~cahcen~~ chance of any of your proposals working out constructively and frankly I see no chance of any of you changing as would be necessary for anything of the nature to work out other than your collective Frankenstein has worked out, even with the prospect of their last-minute Frankenstein sex-changing into a bride.

Bothing person. No anger or bitterness. But in plain English you remain the victims of your own intellectual incest and in plainer English fuckups.

Like Oglesby and that uspeakable debasement of fact and intellect- and he the intellectual - of a Ferrie/Oswald/Marcello cabal. (I asked him the basis for this at the hurried end. All I recall is approximately "didnIt you know?)

The is but one example. I select it because Carl is the so-called intellectual eminence grise and because he has the credentials of his radical past.

I bracket the real disappointment for me. Hoch's incredible personal endorsement of a monster who shames decency, is incapable of honesty and makes any of the Commission people look good, incouding the worst of them. This kind of judgement is self-destructive.

Santayana said, wisely, that he who does not learn from the past is doomed to relive it. You people have not learned this and as of yesterday were pursuing the same selfisheness that you do not recognize as selfishness and again blew the opportunities there were for making effective use of the limited opportunities there were. If after the past on this you cannot overcome it you will not with any new venture.

It is good for young people to regard nothing as impossible. Every once in a while young people make the impossible the actuality. But the years have taught me that there are many impossibilities to be assailed. And I hope they also have taught me to pick and choose between the impossibilities to be accomplished.

There is another question. The years also have taughe me to try to look ahead and to estimate consequences. I don't think you have done this with your new proposals, any one of the alternatives I recall from your memo.

Among the meanings I extract from this is that you have not learned from your own pasts, your many mistakes and their consequences. My opinion is that the consequences are all bad. Even the accidental accomplishments are bad and even in that area all of you, collectively, blew the possibilities presented. If at some point in the future you want to brainstorm this I'd do it if you make a tape and give it to the Archive at Wisconsin.

There is no Phenix of good to rise from the ashes of the bad represented by what lead to and fostered this committee and still reaches out to attribute good ot its evil.

You had this sketch of possibilities for perpetuating yourselves but you had no plans for doing anything about the coming report, which I regard as the immediate problem to be faced. There is no competition between the two so I wonder about the absence of the immediate and the interest in what follows it rather than in it. You may have endorsed the committee's copout in advance for it, giving it credentials it cannot earn or obtain in any legitimate way.

This is off the top of the head. I've not had time to think it through. Taking the time to give you dusorganzied, spontaneous reactions is intended constrictively. I don't care, personally, what you do individually or collectively.

When you refer people to me I'll serve them as best I can, as most recently I did with the woman from Pacifica and with Charmaine Marsh of the Dallas Morning News. I took the time you so-called subject experts should have- and should have done on your own without serving her - to identify all the motorcycle cops immediately around the limo and togive her the citations to testimony, plus a fill-in on why they did not depose Jim Chaney, the fourth.

Before getting to the other things that await I'll take a minor example of the inadequacy of your approach to the specifics as they came up, with the analysis of the tape and its meaning.

The first proof of the presence of a potential or possible or probable gunman at the point decided on was in Whitewash I, which was completed 2/15/65. The evidence used to illustrate this is the identical photo the committee used yesterday, in facsimile in WW I and more with the juxtaposition of the FBI's suppression of that evidence and its meaning. But WWI is not AIB, which goes for the first publication of both the existence of this special segment of police tape and the means of studying it. It is incredible to me that you so-called subject expert were not prepared with it and again I wonder if you all have such poor memories of whether it was because Penn Jones, not AIB, published it in 8/77. (As you know, when I learned that you had goofed on this I went without being able to use it all morning so Oglesby could have it for possible use on PBS.)

This simple combination is a comprehensible and fairly thorough destruction of

the committee, its intent, its competence, its honesty - all areas. It has spent all that money and come up with nothing more than partial confirmation of what dates to early 1965 and by means published more than 15 months ago.

As you will notice I have attributed no good to it in anything I've said. This is not because I'm inflexible or hardheaded. The plain and simple reason is truth. They have been a bad influence, a destructive influence, and they've laid the basis for any future body of your conception succeeding it perpetuating the evil accomplished.

In this they are also cheap crooks. I did not tell the Post that they gypped me out of expenses for two trips to Washington they asked of me, which is true. Instead I told them that as of yesterday they were stealing Groden's work while gypping him out of payment for it as well as credit.

In short, I will speak no good of those who burn mu home down simply because they let a few trees stand. And if they should plant a new tree or two I would not forget that they burned my home down.

There remains the alternatives made impossible by the time and effort and money invested in this abortion. What else could have been done with that? What might still be done with what it will require to attempt to bring your new concepts into being? Have you considered any of this?

So do your thing. If you believe it and believe you should then it is right and proper for you to try to do what you believe is right. I happen to disagree with it but that is my view and you have ti live with your own beliefs, again individually and collectively.

As I said yesterday, some of the recent stuff can't even be called bullshit because there is some value in bullshit. It can be fretilizer.

I don't know what I will consider important in the future or what will compete for my time or what I'll be up to. But I can tell you that if there are future efforts with such stuff as the Oglesby fabrications, which are the perpetuation of the ripoffs of the AIB of old, I'll be tempted not to be quiet. There simple has to be an end of unfactual allegations. They are dishonest and they are self- destructive. I don't care how genuinely Oglesby may believe these lies they are still lies and I now find that the shit thrown at all of you for them has also hit me. I think too much of the work I've done and still hope to do not to consider making some effort at cleansing myself if there is any more of this. And I guaranttee you that I am not impressed by any intellectual pretensions any more than I fear debating any one who again says any such things if there is the opportunity.

To the degree I can have anything to do with this all lies, regardless of what others think these lies are, are going to have to stop or there is going to be the risk of response. I believe you all had better keep this possibility in mind with what I presume now are only tentative plans. Sincerely,